### Region Spec Bad

#### A. Interpretation: the aff must defend a national handgun ban. They may not specify a geographical location within the United States.

#### United States” is defined by the entirety of its territories.

Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms 05 US Department of Defense 2005 http://www.thefreedictionary.com/United+States

United States Includes the land area, internal waters, territorial sea, and airspace of the United States, including the following: a. US territories, possessions, and commonwealths; and b. Other areas over which the US Government has complete jurisdiction and control or has exclusive authority or defense responsibility.

#### “In” means throughout; aff has to defend ban throughout the states.

Words and Phrases Words and Phrases, p. 5 46 (PDNS3566) Harvard Law School Library.Judicial and Statutory Definitions of Words and Phrases. 1904. St. Paul West Publishing Co. Volume 4. (reprint 1924)

In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout” such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

#### B. Violation: they specified a geographical location in the plan text.

#### C. Standards:

#### 1. Accuracy

a. the Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms is written by the US itself so it’s most qualified to determine what counts as “in” the US, Words and Phrases defines “in” in the context of legislative bills that discuss counties and distinct areas.

b. most consistent with common usage- no competent speaker of English would express their belief of the plan by saying “in the united states,” if the res wanted us to specify they would have given us room to.

A few impacts:

A] key to jurisdiction-the ballot asks you to endorse the better debater in the context of the resolution issued by the tournament rules-if you don’t defend the topic then it’s impossible to vote for you, that’s the most important voter.

#### B] Accuracy comes first-the topicality rule is superior and non uniques your offense.

Nebel 15 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the aff**irmative **must defend the res**olution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see **what is distinctive about** Topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the res**olution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations** for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

#### 2. Limits. they massively under-limit the number of affs—you can cherry-pick any region, county, city, or state combined with multiple implementation mechanisms-results in a permutation of thousands of affs.

Impacts:

A) ground loss-you can pick a specific area that excludes common disads and lets you pick the most desirable slice of the resolution. Kills fairness since we both need arguments to win.

B) predictability-I can’t engage in the aff if I can’t predict the specific place you have chosen-you’ll always a have a structural prep advantage over me. Generics don’t solve since you can leverage the specificity of the AC against my generics and you also have infinite prep time. This also precludes all education based offense- even if discussion of the aff is good in the abstract I don’t have the necessary prep.

D. Voters. 1. Vote on fairness, debate’s a competitive activity with wins and losses-if the round is skewed towards once debater you can longer test debate skill. 2. Education is a voter since it’s the end goal of debate and provides portable skills-also why schools fund debate in the first place. 3. Jurisdiction is a voter since if the aff isn’t topical it’s out of your jurisdiction to vote on it and you should default neg as I’m the only one with an advocacy. This also means T comes before theory since jurisdiction is the most important voter.

Drop the debater on T: 1. Drop the arg is severance from the position of the 1AC-you can just read new arguments in the 1AR or connect parts of the aff to whole res which is equivalent to kicking the aff and reading a new plan in the 1AR-skews my strat since I don’t know what you’ll argue for. 2. Drop the arg discourages the neg from reading T to check back abusive affs since they will lose the portion of the 1nc they spent arguing T, making it more strategic to let the aff get away with their non-topical affs which kills fairness and education since affs will get away with sketchy positions. 3. I had to spend time reading T to check back abuse-dropping the arg means a portion of my 1nc is moot which kills fairness and education.

Competing interps since 1. Reasonability causes a race to the bottom where we read increasingly unfair practices that minimally fit the brightline. Competing interps maximizes fairness and education by fostering good norms for the activity. 2. Reasonability collapses to competing interps-you use an offense-defense paradigm to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps-also means your arguments are infinitely regressive since reasons why reasonability is itself reasonable are circular and illogical.

No RVIs. 1. Illogical. Just because you are fair doesn’t mean you should win. If that were true, both debaters would win rounds without theory, which would be irresolvable, and resolvability comes first since every debate needs a winner. 2. Chilling effect. Either I read theory and you beat me with your 4 minute prep out or I don’t read theory and abusive practices prevail-both kill fairness. 3. Topical clash. RVIs kill substantive debate. Once theory is initiated we can never go back to substance, because it’s unnecessary so nobody will engage in the topic. 4. Norm setting. I can’t concede that the counter-interp is better even if I come to that realization in the middle of the round, so the RVI forces debaters to argue for bad debate practices, which is inimical to the most fair and educational interps in the long run.

## 2NR

### Limits o/w

Limits outweighs: A. worst harm to fairness-you’ll always have prep for a hyper-specific aff that I simply cannot answer. Generics don’t solve since there are only a certain number of them and you can prep them out-also you can leverage the specificity of the aff to exclude them which means you’re always at a massive comparative advantage. *B. this controls the internal link to policymaking—if I can’t predict the aff then we can’t have a policy debate over that—that’s the conceded education link from the 1NC.*

Solvency advocate doesn’t check: 1. You have no qualifier for what counts as a solvency advocate-under your interp you could claim yourself or any crackpot author as a solvency advocate, 2. You don’t meet your own threshold—no author advocates the specific phrasing of the plan as you have worded it so you technically don’t have one.

Disclosure doesn’t solve since 1. You can put lots of different plan texts on the wiki and I wouldn’t know which one to prep against, 2. I only know about disclosure right before the round-this doesn’t solve pre-tournament prep which is key to negative strategy since it’s a controlled environment for people to get their work done.

### o/w 1AR theory

As an underview: plans bad outweighs 1AR theory: A. neg abuse is justified on the basis of a plan that gives me terrible ground and is unpredictable-I had to choose an abusive neg strat to compensate for your abuse which proves you’re the root cause of unfairness in the round. B. unfairness about aff advocacies precedes other forms of abuse since the neg is reactive and it frames what arguments I have to read.

### A2 In=Within

In as within relates to time, not geographic location

National Reporter System 4 Words and Phrases, p. 5 46 (PDNS3566) Harvard Law School Library.Judicial and Statutory Definitions of Words and Phrases. 1904. St. Paul West Publishing Co. Volume 4. (reprint 1924) NP 12/30/15

**In as within; The Century Dictionary.** vol. 3, p. 2034, **has** the following **meanings of "in" as a preposition of time:** "(a) Of a point of time, or a period taken as a point: at. (b) Of a course or period of time: within the limits or duration of: during. (c) Of a limited time: at the expiration of." As used in an advertising contract providing that the advertising may be discontinued "in" three months, the word operates to make the phrase capable of being interpreted to mean either that the contract may terminate at any time within three months or at the expiration of three months, but not to authorize its termination after such time. Ferree v. Moquin-Offerman-Hessenbuttel Coal Co., 61 N. Y. Supp. 120, 121, 29 Misc. Rep. 624.

### A2 side bias

1. T - You get framing issues, matter most since it’s what the judge internalizes
2. Aff gets infinite prep time before the AC, whereas neg gets four minutes, o/w on magnitude since, a) prep time controls the link to in round quality arguments, otherwise speech time isn't spent generating offense so prep time disparities are more impactful, b) We both have thirteen minutes, but you have drastically more prep time, also o/w on c) measurability since prep time comparison is quantifiable. This is obviously exacerbated if you get to parametricize to any issue.

### A2 It’s controversial

1. Issues that are controversial can still be super one-sided, lots of people just have bad views
2. *No date’s an independent reason to reject – controversy of issues changes over time*
3. There being lit doesn’t justify why I have access to it; there’s tons of current events issues and INFINITE locations so I won’t know whether or not to prep it

### A2 my issue is controversial

1. No abuse
   1. Read about it
   2. Do speech and talk about the issue
   3. Read an advantage about it
   4. Petition policymakers so that they enact the issue
   5. Petition NSDA and get the topic changed
   6. Submit it as a topic and we’ll talk about it next year

### A2 stable advocacy

1. T-if you defend the entire resolution then there’s nothing to shift out of since you defend all effects of the advocacy.

2. T-plans are shifty since there are lots of different implementation, enforcement and funding mechanisms.

3. CX solves ambiguities; I can hold you to things through clarification and asking.

4. If you do shift, I can just read 2NR theory after the fact which is better for my strategy since it’s a persuasive argument with in round abuse.

5. don’t vote on altruistic standards-if I thought that was an issue I wouldn’t have read theory.

### A2 policymaking

1. non unique-under my interp you still defend a policy, just a really large policy. You can read specific advantages that are functionally plans which takes out all your offense-we still get education I’m just allowed links to other disads.

2. T-not all of us will become policymakers but all of us need to know about generic current events in our life, meaning my interp is more useful in the real world.

3. debating in policy solves your offense-you can switch activities but LD is key to general principle so my offense is unique

### A2 Depth

1. The resolution’s narrow enough – it constrains our education to one topic area and kind of action to be taken, further specification minimizes relevancy of information
2. T – we can go in depth by having a deep understanding of one issue, otherwise we’ll only get the surface
3. T – I’ll have worse prep since you have infinite prep time so we’ll never engage each other to have an in depth conversation
4. Breadth is better than depth-here’s a carded pedagogical meta-study with lots of warrants.

Bile 87 Jeffrey Bile (Associate Professor, School of Communication, Spalding University) “When the Whole is Greater than the Sum of the Parts: The Implications of Holistic Resolutional Focus” Contemporary Argumentation & Debate 8-15 1987

Holistic resolutional focus is pedagogically preferable to the par- ametric approach. Academic debate is a powerful educational tool. In addition to the plethora of other process-based advantages, debaters are forced to learn a great deal substantively about significant contemporary topics in their world (Freeley, 1986). Once we accept that debaters will learn about the topics they debate, we must confront the question "What is it that we want them to learn?" Holistic topic focus promotes a more general education than relatively narrow parametric sub-topics. This stands to reason since the research, preparation presentation; and analysis of more general arguments is encouraged by a more general focus. The pedagogical question becomes: "Is a general or a specific educational focus pedagogically superior?" Murty (1963) argues that "unless a man is capable of thinking and planning for himself, and unless he is able to rise above the parochial- ism of his own time, race and society . . . he cannot lead a full and integrated life. General education alone can enable everyone to do this" (po 44). Murty lists holistic and synthetic thinking as well as recognition of pattern and perspective among the fruits of a general education. This author favors general education for a number of reasons. Initially, general education enhances content relevance. Ulrich (1985) suggests that arguing generics can force the debater to understand issues common to a wide range of affairs. Sawhill (1970) concludes that general education has importance far beyond its immediate concern. This is intuitive. It is very unlikely that our students will ever be asked to decide the fate of a proposal for a one percent increase in M-16’s; it is far more likely however that they will be asked to make decisions regarding the appropriate level of general military preparedness our nation should pursue. Additionally , general education tends to have greater longevity (Goodlad, 1976) since "theories" tend to have more staying-power than "facts." Educators argue for example that "liberal education provides a general background which makes reorientation easier. By stressing the theory of a subject matter, it avoids imprisonment in the narrow applications which may soon be obsolete" (Eastman, 1981, p. 30). The general intellectual skills associated with a broad based education are quite valuable. Biscounti's research (1976) found that only 8% of graduates listed specific knowledge as the most important aspect of their education and that the number decreased as their careers progressed. "Instead they reported that general concepts of their majors, general learning , in college, and the study experience itself were more valuable. These results suggest that, over time, the value of specific knowledge declines while the importance of general intellectual skills associated with liberal education grows." For example understanding the specifics of Reagan's military policies will have less relevance after 1989, understanding the merits of military preparedness how- ever, will have utility for as long as there are m ilitaries. General education is preferable therefore since it enhances the relevance and longevity of learning.

### Nina definition weighing

This outweighs: A. Context – in as within is defined here within a legal context, B. precision- In as within relates to time, not geographic location

National Reporter System 4 Words and Phrases, p. 5 46 (PDNS3566) Harvard Law School Library.Judicial and Statutory Definitions of Words and Phrases. 1904. St. Paul West Publishing Co. Volume 4. (reprint 1924) NP 12/30/15

**In as within; The Century Dictionary.** vol. 3, p. 2034, **has** the following **meanings of "in" as a preposition of time:** "(a) Of a point of time, or a period taken as a point: at. (b) Of a course or period of time: within the limits or duration of: during. (c) Of a limited time: at the expiration of." As used in an advertising contract providing that the advertising may be discontinued "in" three months, the word operates to make the phrase capable of being interpreted to mean either that the contract may terminate at any time within three months or at the expiration of three months, but not to authorize its termination after such time. Ferree v. Moquin-Offerman-Hessenbuttel Coal Co., 61 N. Y. Supp. 120, 121, 29 Misc. Rep. 624.

C. probability – in as within could have multiple interpretations – i.e. within all of or in a small location, but in as throughout only has one interpretation. D. if the framers wanted us to focus on a more specific location they would have specified one, so the topic focuses on the U.S. as a whole. E. logical consistency – I can privately own something even if I can’t use it in a specific place, e.g. people can own dogs even if they can’t take them on planes, so only defending the entire U.S. could ban private ownership, F. **Merriam Webster defines ban**:[[1]](#footnote-1) as **to forbid people from using** (something) : to say that something cannot be used or done,but no one is prevented from using handguns since they can move to get around the restriction

1. : http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ban [↑](#footnote-ref-1)